


GM Crops & Food >

Biotechnology in Agriculture and the Food Chain

Volume 8, 2017 - Issue 3

 Open access

18,192 41

Views

CrossRef citations to date

39

Altmetric


Listen

Research Papers

Farm income and production impacts of using GM crop technology 1996–2015

Graham Brookes  & Peter Barfoot 

Pages 156–193 | Received 10 Feb 2017, Accepted 04 Apr 2017, Published online: 19 Jun 2017

 Cite this article  <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645698.2017.1317919> Check for updates Full Article Figures & data References Citations Metrics Licensing Reprints & Permissions View PDF

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an assessment of the value of using genetically modified (GM) crop technology in agriculture at the farm level. It follows and updates earlier annual studies which examined impacts on yields, key variable costs of production, direct farm (gross) income and impacts on the production base of the 4 main crops of soybeans, corn, cotton and canola. The commercialisation of GM crops has occurred at a rapid rate since the

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

KEYWORDS: cost genetically modified crops income production yield

2015 represents the twentieth year of widespread cultivation of crops containing genetically modified (GM) traits, with the global planted area of GM-traited crops at about 172 million hectares.

This study updates the findings of earlier analysis into the global impact of GM crops since their commercial introduction in 1996 by integrating data and analysis for 2015. Previous analysis by the current authors has been published in various journals, including *AgbioForum* 12 (Brookes and Barfoot, [2009](#)) (2), 184–208, the *International Journal of Biotechnology* (Brookes and Barfoot, [2011](#)), vol. 13, 1/2, 1–49 and *GM Crops* 3:4, 265–274. This paper is a revised and updated version of the analysis published in *AgbioForum* 12 (2), 184–208.

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Essential Only


Settings



However, these are not included because undertaking such an exercise would add considerably to the length of the paper and an assessment of wider economic impacts would probably merit a separate assessment in its own right.

HT Crops

The main impact of GM HT (largely tolerant to the broad-spectrum herbicide glyphosate) technology has been to provide more cost effective (less expensive) and easier weed control for farmers. Nevertheless, some users of this technology have also derived higher yields from better weed control (relative to weed control obtained from conventional technology). The magnitude of these impacts varies by country and year, and is mainly due to prevailing costs of different herbicides used in GM HT systems versus conventional alternatives, the mix and amounts of herbicides applied, the cost farmers pay for accessing the GM HT technology and levels of weed problems. The following important factors affecting the level of cost savings achieved in recent years should be noted:



The most common types of cookies are either 'first party' or 'third party'.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

price of glyphosate relative to changes in the price of other herbicides commonly used on conventional crops. This abated in 2010 with a decline in the price of glyphosate back to previous historic trend levels;

- The amount farmers pay for use of the technology varies by country. Pricing of technology (all forms of seed and crop protection technology, not just GM technology) varies according to the level of benefit that farmers are likely to derive from it. In addition, it is influenced by intellectual property rights (patent protection, plant breeders' rights and rules relating to use of farm-saved seed). In countries with weaker intellectual property rights, the cost of the technology tends to be lower than in countries where there are stronger rights. This is examined further in c) below;

- Where GM HT crops (tolerant to glyphosate) have been widely grown, some incidence of weed resistance to glyphosate has occurred and resistance has become a major concern in some regions. This has been attributed to how glyphosate was used; because of its broad-spectrum post-emergence activity, it was often used as the sole method of weed control. This approach to weed control put tremendous selection pressure on weeds and as a result contributed to the evolution of weed populations predominated by resistant individual weeds. It should, however, be noted that there are hundreds of resistant weed species confirmed in the International Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds (www.weedscience.com). Worldwide, there are 36 weed species that are currently (accessed February 2017) resistant to glyphosate, compared with 159 weed species resistant to ALS herbicides (eg, chlorimuron ethyl commonly used in conventional soybean crops) and 74 weed species resistant to photosystem II inhibitor herbicides (eg, atriazine commonly used in corn production). In addition, it should be noted that the adoption of GM HT technology has played a major role in facilitating the

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



systems to minimise and slow down the potential for weeds developing resistance to existing technology solutions (Norsworthy et al., [2012](#)). At the macro level, these changes have influenced the mix, total amount, cost and overall profile of herbicides applied to GM HT crops. Relative to the conventional alternative, however, the economic impact of the GM HT crop use has continued to offer important advantages for most users. It should also be noted that many of the herbicides used in conventional production systems had significant resistance issues themselves in the mid 1990s. This was one of the reasons why glyphosate tolerant soybeans were rapidly adopted, as glyphosate provided good control of these weeds. If the GM HT technology was no longer delivering net economic benefits, it is likely that farmers around the world would have significantly reduced their adoption of this technology in favor of conventional alternatives. The fact that GM HT global crop adoption levels have not fallen in recent years suggests that farmers must be continuing to derive important economic benefits from using the technology.

These points are further illustrated in the analysis below.

GM HT Soybeans

The average impacts on gross farm level profitability from using this technology are summarised in [Table 1](#). The main farm level gain experienced has been a reduction in the cost of production, mainly through reduced expenditure on weed control (herbicides). Not surprisingly, where yield gains have occurred from improvements in the level of weed control, the average farm income gain has tended to be higher, in countries such as Romania, Mexico and Bolivia. A second generation of GM HT soybeans became available to commercial soybean growers in the US and Canada in 2009. This technology offered the same tolerance to glyphosate as the first generation (and the potential for weed resistance management). The adoption of this technology has been rapid, with over 100 million hectares of this technology planted in 2011.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

GM HT soybeans have also facilitated the adoption of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle. This advantage has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to traditional soybean production, has added considerably to farm incomes and to the volumes of soybean production in countries such as Argentina and Paraguay.

Overall, in 2015, GM HT technology in soybeans (excluding second generation ‘Intacta’ soybeans: see below) has boosted gross farm incomes by \$3.82 billion, and since 1996 has delivered \$50 billion of extra farm income. Of the total cumulative farm income gains from using GM HT soybeans, \$23.6 billion (47%) has been due to yield gains/second crop benefits and the balance, 53%, has been due to cost savings.

GM HT and IR (Intacta) Soybeans

This combination of GM herbicide tolerance (to glyphosate) and insect resistance in soybeans was first grown commercially in 2013, in South America. In the first 3 years, the technology was used on approximately 22.3 million hectares and contributed an additional \$2.4 billion to gross farm income of soybean farmers in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, through a combination of cost savings (decreased expenditure on herbicides and insecticides) and higher yields (see [Table 1](#)).

GM HT Maize

The adoption of GM HT maize has mainly resulted in lower costs of production, although yield gains from improved weed control have arisen in Argentina, Brazil and the Philippines ([Table 2](#)).

TABLE 1: Gross farm income impact of GM HT soybeans in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, 2013-2015

Download

In 2015, with the \$3.44 bi In this article

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

me

1.8 billion

thin this,

costs of

GM HT Cotton

The use of GM HT cotton delivered a gross farm income gain of about \$116.7 million in 2015. In the 1996–2015 period, the total gross farm income benefit was \$1.77 billion. As with other GM HT traits, these farm income gains have mainly arisen from cost savings (73% of the total gains), although there have been some yield gains in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Colombia ([Table 3](#)).

TABLE 3. GM HT cotton summary of average gross farm income impacts 1996–2015 (\$/hectare).

Download CSV

Display Table

Other HT Crops

GM HT canola (tolerant to glyphosate or glufosinate) has been grown in Canada, the US, and more recently Australia, while GM HT sugar beet is grown in the US and Canada. The gross farm income impacts associated with the adoption of these technologies are summarised in [Table 4](#). In both cases, the main farm income benefit has derived from yield gains. In 2015, the total global income gain from the adoption of GM HT technology in canola and sugar beet was \$709 million and cumulatively since 1996, it was \$5.89 billion.

TABLE 4. Other GM HT crops summary of average gross farm income impacts 1996–2015 (\$/hectare).

Download CSV

Display Table

GM IR

The

through

)

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

has been

lds ([Table 5](#)

In this article

^

TABLE 5. Average (%) yield gains GM IR cotton and maize 1996–2015.



[Download CSV](#) [Display Table](#)

The greatest improvement in yields has occurred in developing countries, where conventional methods of pest control have been least effective (eg, reasons such as less well developed extension and advisory services, lack of access to finance to fund use of crop protection application equipment and products), with any cost savings associated with reduced insecticide use being mostly found in developed countries. These effects can be seen in the level of farm income gains that have arisen from the adoption of these technologies, as shown in [Table 6](#).

TABLE 6. GM IR crops: Average gross farm income benefit 1996–2015 (\$/hectare).



[Download CSV](#) [Display Table](#)

At the aggregate level, the global gross farm income gains from using GM IR maize and cotton in 2015 were \$4.46 billion and \$3.27 billion respectively. Cumulatively since 1996, the gains have been \$46 billion for GM IR maize and \$50.3 billion for GM IR cotton.

Aggregated (Global Level) Impacts

GM crop technology has had a significant positive impact on global gross farm income, which are valued at \$50.3 billion for GM IR cotton and \$46 billion for GM IR maize. Since 1996, the gains have been \$50.3 billion for GM IR cotton and \$46 billion for GM IR maize. At the aggregate level, the global gross farm income gains from using GM IR maize and cotton in 2015 were \$4.46 billion and \$3.27 billion respectively. Cumulatively since 1996, the gains have been \$50.3 billion for GM IR cotton and \$46 billion for GM IR maize. At the aggregate level, the global gross farm income gains from using GM IR maize and cotton in 2015 were \$4.46 billion and \$3.27 billion respectively. Cumulatively since 1996, the gains have been \$50.3 billion for GM IR cotton and \$46 billion for GM IR maize.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

[Accept All](#)

[Essential Only](#)

[Settings](#)



America (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay and Uruguay), mostly from GM technology in soybeans and maize. GM IR cotton has also been responsible for an additional \$38.2 billion additional income for cotton farmers in China and India.

In 2015, 48.7% of the farm income benefits were earned by farmers in developing countries. The vast majority of these gains have been from GM IR cotton and GM HT soybeans. Over the 20 y 1996–2015, the cumulative farm income gain derived by developing country farmers was \$86.1 billion, equal to 51.3% of the total farm income during this period.

The cost to farmers for accessing GM technology, across the 4 main crops, in 2015, was equal to 29% of the total value of technology gains. This is defined as the farm income gains referred to above plus the cost of the technology payable to the seed supply chain. Readers should note that the cost of the technology accrues to the seed supply chain including sellers of seed to farmers, seed multipliers, plant breeders, distributors and the GM technology providers.

In developing countries, the total cost was equal to 20% of total technology gains compared with 36% in developed countries. While circumstances vary between countries, the higher share of total technology gains accounted for by farm income in developing countries relative to developed countries reflects factors such as weaker provision and enforcement of intellectual property rights in developing countries and the higher average level of farm income gain per hectare derived by farmers in developing countries compared with those in developed countries.

Seventy-two per cent of the total income gain over the 20-year period derives from higher yields and second crop soybean gains with 28% from lower costs (mostly on insecticides and herbicides). In terms of the 2 main trait types, insect resistance and herbicide tolerance have accounted for 58% and 42% respectively of the total income gain. The savings relative to cost

2015 the d. Thus in and 16%

Crop 1

Based on ons above

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

have added important volumes to global production of corn, cotton, canola and soybeans since 1996 ([Table 7](#)).

TABLE 7. Additional crop production arising from positive yield effects of GM crops.



[Download CSV](#) [Display Table](#)

The GM IR traits, used in maize and cotton, have accounted for 94.7% of the additional maize production and 98.9% of the additional cotton production. Positive yield impacts from the use of this technology have occurred in all user countries, except for GM IR cotton in Australia where the levels of *Heliothis* sp (boll and bud worm pests) pest control previously obtained with intensive insecticide use were very good. The main benefit and reason for adoption of this technology in Australia has arisen from significant cost savings and the associated environmental gains from reduced insecticide use, when compared with average yields derived from crops using conventional technology (such as application of insecticides and seed treatments). The average yield impact across the total area planted to these traits over the 20 y since 1996 has been +13.1% for maize and +15% for cotton.

As indicated earlier, the primary impact of GM HT technology has been to provide more cost effective (less expensive) and easier weed control, as opposed to improving yields, the improved weed control has, nevertheless, delivered higher yields in some countries. The main source of additional production from this technology has been via the facilitation of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle and how it has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to

tradition production in Argentina the total GM

HT-related or 5.84



CONC



About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

The use of crop biotechnology, by 18 million farmers in 2015, has delivered important farm income benefits over the 20-year period to 2015. The GM IR traits have mostly delivered higher incomes through improved yields in all countries. Many farmers, especially in developed countries, have also benefited from lower costs of production (less expenditure on insecticides). The GM HT technology-driven farm income gains have mostly arisen from reduced costs of production, notably on weed control. In South America, the technology has also facilitated the move away from conventional to low/no-tillage production systems and, by effectively shortening the production cycle for soybeans, enabled many farmers to plant a second crop of soybeans after wheat in the same season. In addition, second generation GM HT soybeans, now widely used in North America, are delivering higher yields, as are the new 'stacked' traited HT and IR soybeans being used in South America since 2013.

In relation to HT crops, over reliance on the use of glyphosate and the lack of crop and herbicide rotation by farmers, in some regions, has contributed to the development of weed resistance. To address this problem and maintain good levels of weed control, farmers have increasingly adopted more integrated weed management strategies incorporating a mix of herbicides, other HT crops and cultural weed control measures (in other words using other herbicides with glyphosate rather than solely relying on glyphosate, using HT crops which are tolerant to other herbicides, such as glufosinate and using cultural practices such as mulching). This has added cost to the GM HT production systems compared with about 10 y ago, although relative to the current conventional alternative, the GM HT technology continues to offer important economic benefits in 2015.

Overall, there is a considerable body of evidence, in peer reviewed literature, and summarised in this paper, that quantifies the positive 'economic' impacts of crop biotechnology. The analysis in this paper therefore provides insights into the reasons

why so many farmers have adopted crop biotechnology, and the many other benefits (see below) and to



About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

The report is based on extensive analysis of existing farm level impact data for GM crops, much of which can be found in peer reviewed literature. Most of this literature broadly refers to itself as ‘economic impact’ literature and applies farm accounting or partial budget approaches to assess the impact of GM crop technology on revenue, key costs of production (notably cost of seed, weed control, pest control and use of labor) and gross farm income. While primary data for impacts of commercial cultivation were not available for every crop, in every year and for each country, a substantial body of representative research and analysis is available and this has been used as the basis for the analysis presented. In addition, the authors have undertaken their own analysis of the impact of some trait-crop combinations in some countries (notably GM herbicide tolerant (HT) traits in North and South America) based on herbicide usage and cost data.

As indicated in earlier papers, the ‘economic’ impact of this technology at the farm level varies widely, both between and within regions/countries. Therefore, the measurement of impact is considered on a case by case basis in terms of crop and trait combinations and is based on the average performance and impact recorded in different crops by the studies reviewed. Where more than one piece of relevant research (eg, on the impact of using a GM trait on the yield of a crop in one country in a particular year) has been identified, the findings used in this analysis reflect the authors assessment of which research is most likely to be reasonably representative of impact in the country in that year. For example, there are many papers on the impact of GM insect resistant (IR) cotton in India. Few of these are reasonably representative of cotton growing across the country, with many papers based on small scale, local and unrepresentative samples of cotton farmers. Only the reasonably representative research has been drawn on for use in this paper – readers should consult the references to this paper to identify the sources used.

This app
some tra
has prov
locati
impa
if the on
current a
currentl

In this article

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

chnology for
chnology
crop,
te available
In addition,
t basing
ature of
The

weaknesses. To reduce the possibilities of over/understating impact due to these factors, the analysis:

- Directly applies impacts identified from the literature to the years that have been studied. As a result, the impacts used vary in many cases according to the findings of literature covering different years. Examples where such data are available include the impact of GM insect resistant (IR) cotton: in India (see Bennett et al. ([2004](#)); IMRB ([2006](#)) and IMRB ([2007](#))), in Mexico (see Traxler and Godoy-Avila ([2004](#)) and Monsanto Mexico annual monitoring reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture in Mexico) and in the US (see Sankala and Blumenthal ([2003](#), [2005](#)), Mullins and Hudson ([2004](#))). Hence, the analysis takes into account variation in the impact of the technology on yield according to its effectiveness in dealing with (annual) fluctuations in pest and weed infestation levels;
- Uses current farm level crop prices and bases any yield impacts on (adjusted – see below) current average yields. This introduces a degree of dynamic analysis that would, otherwise, be missing if constant prices and average yields identified in year-specific studies had been used;
- It includes some changes and updates to the impact assumptions identified in the literature based on new papers, annual consultation with local sources (analysts, industry representatives, databases of crop protection usage and prices) and some ‘own analysis’ of changes in crop protection usage and prices;
- Adjusts downwards the average base yield (in cases where GM technology has been identified as having delivered yield improvements) on which the yield enhancement has been applied. In this way, the impact on total production is not overstated.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



be) available and used by farmers and there are studies that have assessed trait-specific impacts;

- All values presented are nominal for the year shown and the base currency used is the US dollar. All financial impacts in other currencies have been converted to US dollars at prevailing annual average exchange rates for each year (source: United States Department of Agriculture Economics Research Service);
- The analysis focuses on changes in farm income in each year arising from impact of GM technology on yields, key costs of production (notably seed cost and crop protection expenditure but also impact on costs such as fuel and labor. Inclusion of these costs is, however, more limited than the impacts on seed and crop protection costs because only a few of the papers reviewed have included consideration of such costs in their analysis. In most cases the analysis relates to impact of crop protection and seed cost only, crop quality (eg, improvements in quality arising from less pest damage or lower levels of weed impurities which result in price premia being obtained from buyers) and the scope for facilitating the planting of a second crop in a season (eg, second crop soybeans in Argentina following wheat that would, in the absence of the GM HT seed, probably not have been planted). Thus, the farm income effect measured is essentially a gross margin impact (impact on gross revenue less variable costs of production) rather than a full net cost of production assessment. Through the inclusion of yield impacts and the application of actual (average) farm prices for each year, the analysis also indirectly takes into account the possible impact of GM crop adoption on global crop supply and world prices.

The paper also includes estimates of the production impacts of GM technology at the crop level. These have been aggregated to provide the reader with a global perspective of the broad production impacts of the technology. The production impacts from the yield impacts are shown in Table 1. The production impacts in relation to soybean (for 2015) are shown in Table 2.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



FUNDING

The authors acknowledge that funding toward the researching of this article was provided by Monsanto. The material presented in this paper is, however, the independent views of the authors – it is a standard condition for all work undertaken by PG Economics that all reports are independently and objectively compiled without influence from funding sponsors.

REFERENCES

1. Bennett R, Ismael Y, Kambhampati U, Morse S. Economic impacts of GM cotton in India. *AgBioforum* 2004; 7(3):96–100.
[Google Scholar](#)
2. Brookes G. The farm level impact of using Bt maize in Spain, ICABR conference paper 2003, Ravello, Italy. Also on www.pgeconomics.co.uk.
[Google Scholar](#)
3. Brookes G. The farm level impact of using Roundup Ready soybeans in Romania. *Agbioforum* 2005; 8(4):235–41 www.agbioforum.org.
[Google Scholar](#)
4. Brookes G. The benefits of adopting GM insect resistant (Bt) maize in the EU: first results
<https://www.pgeconomics.co.uk/...>
5. Brookes G. The economic impact of Bt maize in the EU: first results 1996–2007.
[Google Scholar](#)







About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

6. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996–2009. *Int J Biotechnol* 2011; **12**(1/2):1–49; <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBT.2011.042680>
 | [Google Scholar](#)
7. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996–2010. *GM Crops Food* 2012; **3**(4):265–73; PMID:22750951; <https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.20097>
 | [PubMed](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
8. Brookes G, Barfoot P. The income and production effects of biotech crops globally 1996–2011. *GM Crops* 2013; **4**(1):1–10; <https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.22748>
 | [Google Scholar](#)
9. Brookes G, Barfoot P. Economic impact of GM crops: the global income and production effects 1996–2012. *GM Crops Food* 2014; **5**(1):65–75; PMID:24637520; <https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.28098>
 | [PubMed](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
10. Brookes G, Barfoot P. Global income and production impacts of using GM crop technology 1996–2014. *GM Crops Food* 2015; **6**:13–46; PMID:27116697; <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645698.2015.1022310>
 | [PubMed](#) | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
11. Brookes G, Barfoot P. Global income and production impacts of using GM crop technology 1996–2015. *GM Crops* 2016; **7**:38–77; <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645698.2016.1176817>


About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

[Google Scholar](#)

4. CSIRO. The cotton consultants Australia 2005 Bollgard II comparison report, CSIRO, Australia.

[Google Scholar](#)

5. Doyle B. The Performance of Roundup Ready cotton 2001–2002 in the Australian cotton sector, 2003, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

[Google Scholar](#)

6. Doyle B. The Performance of Ingard and Bollgard II Cotton in Australia during the 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 seasons, 2005, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

[Google Scholar](#)

7. Elena M. Economic advantages of transgenic cotton in Argentina, INTA, 2006, cited in Trigo and CAP 2006.

[Google Scholar](#)

8. Falck Zepeda J, Sanders A, Trabanino R, Medina O, Batallas-Huacon R. Small 'resource poor' countries taking advantage of the new bio-economy and innovation: the case of insect protected and herbicide tolerant corn in Honduras, 2009, paper presented to the 13th ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy, June 2009.

[Google Scholar](#)

9. Falck Zepeda J, Sanders A, Trabanino R, Medina O, Batallas-Huacon R. Caught between Scylla and Charybdis: impact estimation issues from the early adoption of

GM m

[Goog](#)

10. Fer
pre

[Goog](#)



About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

21. Fischer J, Tozer P. Evaluation of the environmental and economic impact of Roundup Ready canola in the Western Australian crop production system, 2009, Curtin University of Technology Technical Report 11/2009.

[Google Scholar](#)

22. Fitt G. Deployment and impact of transgenic Bt cotton in Australia, reported in James C (2001), Global review of commercialised transgenic crops: 2001 feature: Bt cotton, ISAAA.

[Google Scholar](#)

23. Galveo A. Unpublished data on first survey findings of impact of insect resistant corn (first crop) in Brazil, 2009, Celeres, Brazil. www.celeres.co.br

[Google Scholar](#)

24. Galveo A. Farm survey findings of impact of insect resistant corn and herbicide tolerant soybeans in Brazil. 2010, Celeres, Brazil. www.celeres.co.br.

[Google Scholar](#)

25. Galveo A. Farm survey findings of impact of GM crops in Brazil 2012, Celeres, Brazil. www.celeres.co.br.

[Google Scholar](#)

26. Galveo A. Farm survey findings of impact of GM crops in Brazil 2015, Celeres, Brazil. www.celeres.co.br.

[Google Scholar](#)

27. Galveo A. Farm survey findings of impact of insect resistant cotton in Brazil, 2010, 2011,

[Goog](#)

28. Ge
cul
Monsa
[Goog](#)




About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

29. Gomez-Barbero M, Barbel J, Rodriguez-Cerezo E. Adoption and performance of the first GM crop in EU agriculture: Bt maize in Spain. 2008. JRC, EU Commission. Eur 22778. <http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu>.
[Google Scholar](#)
30. Gonsales L. Harnessing the benefits of biotechnology: the case of Bt corn in the Philippines. 2005, ISBN 971-91904-6-9. Strive Foundation, Laguna, Philippines.
[Google Scholar](#)
31. Gonsales L. Modern Biotechnology and Agriculture: a history of the commercialisation of biotechnology maize in the Philippines, 2009, Strive Foundation, Los Banos, Philippines, ISBN 978-971-91904-8-6.
[Google Scholar](#)
32. Gouse M, Piesse J, Thirtle C. Output & labour effect of GM maize and minimum tillage in a communal area of Kwazulu-Natal. J Dev Perspect 2006; 2(2):192-207.
[Google Scholar](#)
33. Gouse M, Pray C, Kirsten J, Schimmelpfennig D. A GM subsistence crop in Africa: the case of Bt white maize in S Africa. Int J Biotechnol 2005; 7(1/2/3):84-94;
<https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBT.2005.006447>
 | [Google Scholar](#)
34. Gouse M, Pray C, Kirsten J, Schimmelpfennig D. Three seasons of insect resistant maize in South Africa: have small farmers benefited. AgBioforum 2006; 9(1):15-22.
[Google Scholar](#)

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



37. Hudson D. Evaluation of agronomic, environmental, economic and co-existence impacts following the introduction of GM canola in Australia 2010–2012. Paper presented to the 2012 GMCC conference, Lisbon, Portugal, November 2013.

[Google Scholar](#)

38. Hutchison W, Burkness EC, Mitchel PD, Moon RD, Leslie TW, Fleicher SJ, Abrahamson M, Hamilton KL, Steffey KL, Gray ME et al. Area-wide suppression of European Corn Borer with Bt maize reaps savings to non-bt maize growers. Science 2010; **330**:222–5. www.sciencemag.org; PMID:20929774; <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1190242>

 | [PubMed](#) | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

39. IMRB. Socio-economic benefits of Bollgard and product satisfaction (in India), IMRB International, 2006, Mumbai, India.

[Google Scholar](#)

40. IMRB. Socio-economic benefits of Bollgard and product satisfaction (in India), IMRB International, 2007, Mumbai, India.

[Google Scholar](#)

41. Ismael Y, Bennet R, Morse S. Benefits of bt cotton use by smallholder farmers in South Africa. Agbioforum 2002; **5**(1):1–5.

[Google Scholar](#)

42. James C. Global review of commercialized transgenic crops 2001: feature Bt cotton, ISAAA No 26, 2002.

[Google Scholar](#)

43. James C. Global review of commercialized transgenic crops 2001: feature Bt cotton, ISAAA No 26, 2002.

[Google Scholar](#)

44. John C. Global review of commercialized transgenic crops 2001: feature Bt maize, ISAAA No 26, 2002.

[Google Scholar](#)

About Cookies On This Site





We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).


 Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



45. Jon-Joseph AQ, Sprague CL. Weed management in wide-and narrow-row glyphosate resistant sugar beet. *Weed Technol* 2010; **24**:523–8; <https://doi.org/10.1614/WT-D-10-00033.1>
-  | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
46. Kathage J, Qaim M. *PNAS* 2012. Economic impacts and impact dynamics of Bt cotton in India. Available at: <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1203647109>
-  | [Google Scholar](#)
47. Khan M. Roundup Ready sugar beet in America. *British Sugar Beet Rev* Winter 2008; **76**(4):16–9.
- [Google Scholar](#)
48. Kirsten J, Gouse M. Bt cotton in South Africa: adoption and the impact on farm incomes amongst small-scale and large-scale farmers, ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy 2002.
- [Google Scholar](#)
49. Kniss A. Comparison of conventional and glyphosate resistant sugarbeet the year of commercial introduction in Wyoming. *J Sugar Beet Res* 2010; **47**:127–34; <https://doi.org/10.5274/jsbr.47.3.127>
-  | [Google Scholar](#)
50. Kouser S, Qaim M. Valuing financial, health and environmental benefits of Bt cotton in Pakistan. *Agricultural Econom* 2013; **44**:323–35; <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12014>
-  | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

51. Kouser S, Qaim M. Valuing financial, health and environmental benefits of Bt cotton in Pakistan. *Agricultural Econom* 2013; **44**:323–35; <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12014>
- 
52. Marra V, Qaim M. Valuing financial, health and environmental benefits of Bt cotton in Pakistan. *Agricultural Econom* 2013; **44**:323–35; <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12014>
- [assessment](#)
ngton, USA.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All  Side use in

Essential Only

Settings

53. MB Agro. Intacta soybeans: An economic view of the benefits of adopting the new technology, 2014 report commissioned by Monsanto Brazil.
[Google Scholar](#)
54. Mendez K, Chaparro Giraldo A, Reyes Moreno G, Silva Castro C. Production cost analysis and use of pesticides in the transgenic and conventional crop in the valley of San Juan (Colombia). *GM Crops* 2011; **2**(3):163–8; PMID:22008311;
<https://doi.org/10.4161/gmcr.2.3.17591>
 | [PubMed](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
55. Monsanto Australia. Survey of herbicide tolerant canola licence holders 2008.
[Google Scholar](#)
56. Monsanto Brazil. Farm survey of conventional and Bt cotton growers in Brazil 2007, unpublished.
[Google Scholar](#)
57. Monsanto Romania. Unpublished results of farmer survey amongst soybean growers in 2006 – published in 2007.
[Google Scholar](#)
58. Mullins W, Hudson J. Bollgard II versus Bollgard sister line economic comparisons, 2004 Beltwide cotton conferences, San Antonio, USA, Jan 2004.
[Google Scholar](#)
59. Nazli H, Sarker R, Meilke K, Orden D. Economic performance of Bt cotton varieties in Pakistan. Conference paper at the Agricultural and Applied Economics Association 2010.

Goog

60. No
pra
Specia
Goog



About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

gement
t Weeds

51. Parana Department of Agriculture. Cost of production comparison: biotech and conventional soybeans, in USDA GAIN report, 2004, BR4629 of 11 November 2004. www.fas.usad.gov/gainfiles/200411/146118108.pdf.

[Google Scholar](#)

52. Pray C, Hunag J, Hu R, Roselle S. Five years of Bt cotton in China – the benefits continue. *Plant J* 2002; **31**(4):423–30; PMID:12182701; <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-313X.2002.01401.x>

[PubMed](#) | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

53. Qaim M, De Janvry A. Bt cotton in Argentina: analysing adoption and farmers' willingness to pay, 2002, American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, California.

[Google Scholar](#)

54. Qaim M, De Janvry A. Bt cotton and pesticide use in Argentina: economic and environmental effects. *Environ Dev Econom* 2005; **10**:179–200; <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X04001883>

[Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

55. Qaim M, Traxler G. Roundup Ready soybeans in Argentina: farm level & aggregate welfare effects. *Agricultural Econom* 2005; **32**(1) 73–86.

[Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

56. Ramon G. Acceptability survey on the 80–20 bag in a bag insect resistance management strategy for Bt corn, 2005, Biotechnology Coalition of the Philippines (BCP).

[Google Scholar](#)

57. Rice M. Economic and environmental impacts of Bt cotton in China, 2001–01–RV.

[Google Scholar](#)

58. Riesgo E. The impact of Bt cotton on the environment: a comparison of GM and non-GM cotton in China.

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

[Accept All](#)

[Essential Only](#)

[Settings](#)

middle Ebro Valley, Spain. Spanish J Agricultural Res 2012; 10(4):867-76;

<https://doi.org/10.5424/sjar/2012104-448-11>

 | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

69. Sankala S, Blumenthal E. Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2003- an update of eleven case studies, 2003. NCFAP, Washington.

www.ncfap.org.

[Google Scholar](#)

70. Sankala S, Blumenthal E. Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2005- an update of eleven case studies, 2005 NCFAP, Washington.

www.ncfap.org.

[Google Scholar](#)

71. Traxler G, Godoy-Avila S. Transgenic cotton in Mexico. Agbioforum 2004; 7(1&2):57-62.

[Google Scholar](#)

72. Trigo E. Genetically Modified Crops in Argentina agriculture: an opened story. 2002, Libros del Zorzal, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[Google Scholar](#)

73. Trigo E, Cap E. Ten years of GM crops in Argentine Agriculture, ArgenBio, 2006.

http://argenbio.org/biblioteca/Ten_Years_of_GM_Crops_in_Argentine_Agriculture_02_01_07.pdf.

[Google Scholar](#)

74. USDA. 20025 of

14th J

Goog



75. Val 2008/ for the

2008/

Goog

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings


6. Vitale J. Impact of Bollgard II on the Socio Economic and Health Welfare of Smallholder Cotton Farmers in Burkina Faso: Results of the 2009 Field Survey14th ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy, June 2010.
[Google Scholar](#)
7. Vitale J, Glick H, Greenplate J, Traore O. The economic impact of 2nd generation Bt cotton in West Africa: empirical evidence from Burkina Faso. Int J Biotechnol 2008; 10(2/3):167-83; <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBT.2008.018352>
 | [Google Scholar](#)
8. Yorobe J. Economics impact of Bt corn in the Philippines, 2004, Paper presented to the 45th PAEDA Convention, Querzon City.
[Google Scholar](#)
9. Zambrano P. Insect resistant cotton in Colombia: impact on farmers, paper presented to the 13th ICABR conference, 2009, Ravello, Italy.
[Google Scholar](#)

Appendix 1: Details of methodology as applied to 2015 farm income calculations


GM IR corn (targeting corn boring pests) 2015

Table

Download



GM



Table

In this article

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

GM IR cotton 2015

Table

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

GM HT soybeans 2015 (excluding second crop soybeans – see separate table)

Table

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

GM IR/HT (Intacta) soybeans 2015

Table

[Download CSV](#)

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

[Accept All](#)[Essential Only](#)[Settings](#)

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

GM HT cotton 2015

Table

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

GM HT canola 2015

Table

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

GM virus resistant crops 2015

Table

[Download CSV](#)[Display Table](#)

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click "Settings". For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

[Accept All](#)[Essential Only](#)[Settings](#)

GM

Table

In this article





Second soybean crop benefits: Argentina

An additional farm income benefit that many Argentine soybean growers have derived comes from the additional scope for second cropping of soybeans. This has arisen because of the simplicity, ease and weed management flexibility provided by the (GM) technology which has been an important factor facilitating the use of no and reduced tillage production systems. In turn the adoption of low/no tillage production systems has reduced the time required for harvesting and drilling subsequent crops and hence has enabled many Argentine farmers to cultivate 2 crops (wheat followed by soybeans) in one season. As such, the proportion of soybean production in Argentina using no or low tillage methods has increased from 34% in 1996 to 90% by 2005 and has remained at over 90% since then.

Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Argentina 1996–2015 (2): Second crop soybeans

Table



Download CSV

Display Table

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings



Table

Download CSV

Display Table



Appendix 2: Impacts, assumptions, rationale and sources for all trait/country combinations

IR corn (resistant to corn boring pests)

Table

Download CSV

Display Table



Readers should note that the assumptions are drawn from the references cited supplemented and updated by industry sources (where the authors have not been able to identify specific studies). This has been particularly of relevance for some of the herbicide tolerant traits more recently adopted in several developing countries. Accordingly, the authors are grateful to industry sources which have provided information on impact, (notably on cost of the technology and impact on costs of crop protection). While this information does not derive from detailed studies, the authors are confident that it is reasonably representative of average impacts; in several cases, information provided from industry sources via personal communications has suggested levels of average impact that are lower than that identified in independent studies. Data has been used



Download

About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings

Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



About Cookies On This Site

We and our partners use cookies to enhance your website experience, learn how our site is used, offer personalised features, measure the effectiveness of our services, and tailor content and ads to your interests while you navigate on the web or interact with us across devices. You can choose to accept all of these cookies or only essential cookies. To learn more or manage your preferences, click “Settings”. For further information about the data we collect from you, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Accept All

Essential Only

Settings